

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended.

By this Amendment, Claims 20, 21, 23, 26, 28-31, 33-36 and 39 have been amended for clarity of expression and as discussed in detail below. New Claims 40-45 have been added, and Claims 24 and 25 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer in favor of new Claims 40 and 41 to address the alleged informalities in Claims 24 and 25. Claims 22 and 32 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, Claims 20, 21, 23, 26-31 and 33-45 are pending.

In the Office Action, Claims 20 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Holtey; Claims 20, 21, 26-31, 33, 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Geronimi in combination with Kommerling; and Claims 23-25, 34-36 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Geronimi and Kommerling in further combination with Coyle.

Without acceding to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, independent Claim 20 as amended now recites, *inter alia*, determining, by means for checking the integrity, a specific condition for establishing the integrity of sensitive information to be transmitted on the data bus; transferring a datum of the sensitive information from the storage device to the processing device, on the data bus; verifying the datum transferred on the data bus, by the means for checking the integrity, for verifying that the specific condition is satisfied; and disabling the processing of the sensitive information by the processing device if the specific condition is not satisfied. Support is provided, for example, at page 6, lines 19-21 of Applicant's disclosure.

It is apparent that Holtey does not teach or suggest these features of Claim 20. For example, Holtey discloses an output buffer 52 that is part of a memory section 103M. See Holtey, col. 7, lines 14, 21-27; Fig. 3. Further, Holtey's output buffer 52, data bus 105a, and bus 102 are disclosed as being different structures. See Holtey, col. 7, lines 63-65; Fig. 3. Holtey thus fails to teach or suggest, at minimum, verifying the datum transferred on the data bus, by the means for checking the integrity, for verifying that the specific condition is satisfied, as recited in Claim 20.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 20 patentably distinguishes from Holtey.

Independent Claim 29 as amended now recites, *inter alia*, that the means for checking the integrity verifies a specific condition for integrity by verifying a datum of said sensitive information, transferred on the data bus. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 29 patentably distinguishes from Holtey for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 20.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests the rejection of Claims 20 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

Without acceding to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as discussed above, independent Claim 20 as amended recites, *inter alia*, verifying the datum transferred on the data bus, by the means for checking the integrity, for verifying that the specific condition is satisfied. Independent Claim 29 as amended recites, *inter alia*, that the means for checking the integrity verifies a specific condition for integrity by verifying a datum of said sensitive information, transferred on the data bus. It is apparent that neither Geronimi nor Kommerling, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest at least these claimed features.

As acknowledged in the Office Action, Geronimi fails to disclose details of the claimed testing limitations. In particular, Geronimi teaches testing the state of a register for a normal condition. See Geronimi, col. 2, line 19; col. 4, line 14-24. Kommerling, for its part, apparently teaches a clock frequency sensor and an approach to mitigating clock glitches. See Kommerling, paragraphs 2.2.1 and 3 et seq. It is apparent that neither Geronimi nor Kommerling teach or suggest verifying the datum transferred on the data bus, by the means for checking the integrity, for verifying that the specific condition is satisfied, as recited in Claim 20, or that the means for checking the integrity verifies a specific condition for integrity by verifying a datum of said sensitive information, transferred on the data bus, as recited in Claim 29.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 20 and 29 patentably distinguish from Geronimi and Kommerling, whether taken alone or in combination. It is apparent that the additional secondary reference, Coyle, also fails to teach or suggest the above limitations.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

New dependent Claims 40-45 have been added to protect additional features of Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 40-45 are allowable over the applied prior art due to their dependence from Claims 20 and 29 as well as for the additional features recited in Claims 40-45.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Claims 20 and 29, along with their respective dependents, are now in condition for allowance.

A prompt Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that any further action is necessary to place this application in better form for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant notes that the outstanding Office Action was initially mailed September 12, 2006, and was subsequently remailed September 21, 2006. Because the remailing date establishes the beginning of the period for reply, Ex parte Gourtoff, 1924 C.D. 153, 329 O.G. 536 (Comm'r Pat. 1924); MPEP § 710.06, Applicant respectfully submits that this Amendment is timely submitted within the 3-month Shortened Statutory Period for reply. However, and in any case, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (T2146-906833) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MILES & STOCKBRIDGE, P.C.

December 21, 2006

By :



Edward J. Kondracki  
Reg. No. 20,604

Eric G. King  
Reg. No. 42,736

1751 Pinnacle Drive, Suite 500  
McLean, VA 22102-3833  
Telephone: (703) 610-8647

4835-0529-6641